



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## PUBLICATIONS REVIEWED.

SUMMER BIRDS OF FLATHEAD LAKE, by P. M. Silalloway (= University of Montana Bull., No. 3, Biol. Ser. No. 1, [Dec. ?] 1901).

This is a neatly prepared paper of 83 pages and 16 plates, treating at more or less length of 128 species. The plates are from photos, mostly of nests and eggs, though these are detached, that is, not *in situ*. The accounts relate chiefly to the nesting habits and local distribution of each bird. These are of much general interest for in this section of Montana eastern species are found breeding in close proximity to typically western forms; for example, red-eyed vireo and Audubon warbler, common kingbird and Arkansas kingbird, catbird and Louisiana tanager. We are particularly interested in the extended biographical accounts of the willow thrush, olive-backed thrush, Macgillivray warbler, Audubon warbler, cedar waxwing and Wright flycatcher. The present publication also contains much valuable data for the student of geographical distribution. The known ranges of several forms, such as *Icteria virens longicauda*, seem to be materially extended. As the author clearly states, the records, tentatively made of *Larus occidentalis*, *Melospiza georgiana* and *Coccyzus erythrophthalmus* are open to question, and should not be accepted until their identity is confirmed. We wish that all authors of similar productions would take as much care as is evidenced in Mr. Silalloway's paper. "Summer Birds of Flathead Lake" is a credit to its author and to the University of Montana.—J. G.

ANNOTATED LIST OF THE BIRDS OF OREGON, A. R. Woodcock (=Bull. No. 68, Ore. Agr. Exp. Sta., Jan. 1902).

It was with pleasant anticipation that we began the perusal of this 100-page list. For Oregon is of extreme interest ornithologically, and a succinct resume' of the birds of that State would be a valuable basis for the working faunist, as well as a guide to local observers. But the present paper is a disappointment. It bristles with indefinite statements, questionable records and obvious misidentifications. We cannot help but doubt the records of such species as *Anas penelope* ("common in spring!")" *Gelochelidon nilotica* ("a very common fall migrant"), *Puffinus stricklandi*, *Megascops flammula* ("saw one specimen"), *Hæmatopus palliatus*, *Spizella pusilla arenacea*, and others, besides fully twenty-five misapplied trinomials.

Previous literature relevant to Oregon birds is apparently ignored, only Belding's "Land Birds of the Pacific District," and Bendire's "Life Histories" being quoted. The major part of the information seems to have been de-

rived from local observers some of whom are evidently inexperienced. True, the author disclaims any responsibility for the statements of his correspondents. But still we believe it the duty of compilers to exert intelligent discrimination, at the same time showing utmost conservatism. We cannot see that the present list is of any scientific value whatever. It will certainly serve to increase the drudgery of the synonymist and swell his hypothetical lists. It still remains therefore for someone to prepare an authoritative checklist of Oregon birds.—J. G.

BIRDS OF SONG AND STORY | by | Elizabeth and Joseph Grinnell | Authors of "Our Feathered Friends" | [poem, 7 lines] | [vignette] | Chicago | A. W. Mumford, Publisher | 1901 [December].

To the amateur bird-student and to those who have a taste for literature rather than dry compilations of observations the present book will prove of pleasing interest. The authors have apparently endeavored to sugar-coat a fair amount of information with enough of word-painting and romance to insure its reception by a class of readers which far outnumber real bird-students. The scaffolding of facts presented is true to nature, and in places even the hardened "bird-crank" is thrilled by the vividness of portrayal. The chapter on "The Meadow Lark" happened in particular to impress the present reviewer with its vein of pathos and homely allusion. Among the sixteen chapters contained in the book others which we can especially recommend are on "The Mocking Bird," "The Orioles," "Sparrows and Sparrows," "At Nesting Time," and "The Tanager People." Although evidently intended for more or less juvenile readers, *Birds of Song and Story* will be read with interest by people of maturer taste as well. The sixteen full-page illustrations (of the birds treated in the text) are done in the well-known three-color process.—C. B.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

## Editor THE CONDOR:

In your March issue there appears a letter from Dr. R. W. Shufeldt, in regard to the pterylography of hummingbirds, which seems to me to demand a word of reply. Dr. Shufeldt asks why I inquire whether "hummingbirds are cypseloid or caprimulgoid." If he had read the first paragraph of my paper in *Science* carefully, he would not have to be informed that it was because Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson says they are more caprimulgoid than cypseloid in their pteryloses, while I hold as does Dr. Shufeldt that they are not at all caprimulgoid.

As to whether they are cypseloid or not, Dr.